

195 FERC ¶ 61,029  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Laura V. Swett, Chairman;  
David Rosner, Lindsay S. See,  
Judy W. Chang, and David LaCerte.

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

Docket No. ER26-1397-000

ORDER ACCEPTING TARIFF REVISIONS

(Issued April 14, 2026)

1. On February 13, 2026, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) submitted, pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Power Act (FPA)<sup>1</sup> and Part 35 of the Commission's regulations,<sup>2</sup> proposed revisions to Attachment X (Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP)) of its Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (Tariff) to implement certain changes to its surplus interconnection service and generator replacement request processes. As discussed below, we accept MISO's proposed Tariff revisions,<sup>3</sup> effective April 15, 2026, as requested.

**I. Background**

**A. Order No. 2003**

2. In Order No. 2003,<sup>4</sup> the Commission required public utilities that own, control, or operate transmission facilities to file standard generator interconnection procedures and a standard agreement to provide interconnection service to generating facilities with a capacity greater than 20 MW. To this end, the Commission adopted the *pro forma*

---

<sup>1</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 824d.

<sup>2</sup> 18 C.F.R. pt. 35 (2025).

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix for tariff records accepted in this order.

<sup>4</sup> *Standardization of Generator Interconnection Agreements & Procs.*, Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 (2003), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-A, 106 FERC ¶ 61,220, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-B, 109 FERC ¶ 61,287 (2004), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2003-C, 111 FERC ¶ 61,401 (2005), *aff'd sub nom. Nat'l Ass'n of Regul. Util. Comm'rs v. FERC*, 475 F.3d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 2007).

Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP) and *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA) and required all public utilities subject to Order No. 2003 to modify their tariffs to incorporate the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA.<sup>5</sup>

3. The Commission permitted transmission providers to seek variations from the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA if those variations were “consistent with or superior to” the terms of the *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA.<sup>6</sup> In addition, the Commission indicated that it would allow regional transmission organizations and independent system operators (RTO/ISO), such as MISO, to propose independent entity variations for pricing and non-pricing provisions, stating that RTOs/ISOs have different operating characteristics due to their sizes and locations and that an RTO/ISO is less likely to act in an unduly discriminatory manner than a transmission provider that is also a market participant.<sup>7</sup> The Commission found that RTOs/ISOs “shall therefore have greater flexibility to customize [their] interconnection procedures and agreements to fit regional needs.”<sup>8</sup> Under the independent entity variation standard, an RTO/ISO must demonstrate that proposed revisions from the Commission’s *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential and accomplish the purposes of Order No. 2003.<sup>9</sup>

#### **B. Order Nos. 845 and 845-A**

4. In Order Nos. 845 and 845-A, the Commission revised *pro forma* LGIP section 1 (Definitions) and *pro forma* LGIA article 1, and adopted *pro forma* LGIP sections 3.3 (Utilization of Surplus Interconnection Service) and 3.3.1 (Surplus Interconnection Service Request), to establish surplus interconnection service, which the Commission defined as any unneeded portion of interconnection service established in an LGIA such that if the surplus interconnection service is utilized, the total amount of interconnection

---

<sup>5</sup> Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 at PP 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* PP 825-826. The Commission also permitted transmission providers to justify a variation from the *pro forma* LGIP or *pro forma* LGIA based on regional reliability requirements and required transmission providers to submit these regional reliability variations to the Commission for approval under the relevant reliability standard. *Id.* PP 824, 826.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* P 827.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *See, e.g., Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 185 FERC ¶ 61,084, at P 11 (2023) (citing Order No. 2003, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 at PP 26, 827).

service at the point of interconnection would remain the same.<sup>10</sup> Surplus interconnection service enables a new interconnection customer to utilize the unused portion of an existing interconnection customer's interconnection service within specific parameters.<sup>11</sup> The Commission required transmission providers to revise their tariffs to include the new definition of surplus interconnection service in their *pro forma* LGIP and *pro forma* LGIA, and provide in their LGIP an expedited interconnection process outside of the interconnection queue for surplus interconnection service.<sup>12</sup>

5. The Commission accepted MISO's compliance filings for Order Nos. 845 and 845-A effective December 19, 2019.<sup>13</sup>

### C. Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A

6. In Order No. 2023, the Commission revised section 3.3.1 of the *pro forma* LGIP to require transmission providers to allow interconnection customers to access the surplus interconnection service process once the original interconnection customer has an executed LGIA or requests the filing of an unexecuted LGIA.<sup>14</sup> The Commission found that this reform would enable interconnection customers with unused interconnection service to let other generating facilities use that interconnection service earlier than was currently allowed and, therefore, would increase overall efficiency of the interconnection queue and in turn ensure just and reasonable rates.<sup>15</sup> The Commission clarified that this reform did not modify how the surplus interconnection service process was conducted,

---

<sup>10</sup> *Reform of Generator Interconnection Procs. & Agreements*, Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043, at P 467 (2018), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 845-B, 168 FERC ¶ 61,092 (2019).

<sup>11</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 467; Order No. 845-A, 166 FERC ¶ 61,137 at P 119.

<sup>12</sup> Order No. 845, 163 FERC ¶ 61,043 at P 467.

<sup>13</sup> *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 169 FERC ¶ 61,221 (2019); *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 171 FERC ¶ 61,236 (2020); *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, Docket No. ER19-1960-004 (Nov. 30, 2020) (delegated order).

<sup>14</sup> *Improvements to Generator Interconnection Procs. & Agreements*, Order No. 2023, 184 FERC ¶ 61,054, at P 1436, *order on reh'g*, 185 FERC ¶ 61,063 (2023), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2023-A, 186 FERC ¶ 61,199, *errata notice*, 188 FERC ¶ 61,134 (2024); *see also pro forma* LGIP § 3.3.1.

<sup>15</sup> Order No. 2023, 184 FERC ¶ 61,054 at P 1437.

but rather addressed when a request for surplus interconnection service may be submitted.<sup>16</sup>

7. To date, the Commission has found that MISO's proposed Tariff revisions partially comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A. Accordingly, the Commission has accepted MISO's compliance filings for Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A in part, including MISO's proposed Tariff revisions to comply with the surplus interconnection service requirements of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, effective July 28, 2025, and directed further compliance.<sup>17</sup>

#### **D. Surplus Interconnection Service Process in MISO**

8. MISO states that recently there has been a significant increase in the usage of surplus interconnection service in its region, which has exposed several process inefficiencies. MISO states that the average length of the surplus interconnection study period has lengthened due to an increase in requested *ad hoc* studies. MISO states that the request for additional studies, such as interconnection facilities studies, is standard practice for more complex surplus interconnection requests, but transmission owners have recently begun requesting these studies more often regardless of the complexity of the request. Additionally, MISO states that interconnection customers are increasingly modifying their surplus interconnection requests after studies have begun, which has led to restudies in a study process that does not benefit from "reiterative studies."<sup>18</sup>

#### **II. Filing**

9. MISO states that it proposes several surplus interconnection service process improvements. First, MISO proposes Tariff revisions to create the defined term "surplus host unit" and define it as "the Generating Facility from which Surplus Interconnection Service will be obtained."<sup>19</sup> MISO states that its existing Tariff lacks a defined term to distinguish generating facilities without surplus interconnection service from generating facilities with surplus interconnection service, an omission that makes it more difficult to clearly communicate and distinguish the rights and responsibilities of each facility type. MISO states that its Tariff currently uses the phrase "the Generating Facility from which

---

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* P 1447.

<sup>17</sup> *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,229, at PP 1, 279 (2025); *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 194 FERC ¶ 61,203, at PP 1, 161 (2026).

<sup>18</sup> Transmittal at 5-6.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 10-11. MISO proposes to add the definition to section 1 of its GIP. MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 1 (Definitions).

Surplus Interconnection Service will be obtained.”<sup>20</sup> MISO asserts that a defined term will help the involved parties conceptualize, develop, and subsequently apply requirements intended only for surplus host units. MISO also proposes to replace all existing references to “the Generating Facility from which Surplus Interconnection Service will be obtained” in MISO’s GIP with the newly defined term “Surplus Host Unit.”<sup>21</sup>

10. Second, MISO proposes revisions for two proposals related to the timing of the surplus interconnection study and a material modification request for the surplus host unit. Specifically, MISO proposes new GIP section 3.3.1.1(5) to provide that:

If a Material Modification study for the Surplus Host Unit is pending at the time the surplus Interconnection Request is submitted, then the surplus Interconnection Study for Surplus Interconnection Service shall not kickoff until the Material Modification study has completed and any approved modifications have been added to Generation Interconnection Agreement.<sup>22</sup>

Additionally, MISO proposes new provisions in GIP section 3.3.1.2(1) to provide that:

After the commencement of the surplus Interconnection Study for Surplus Interconnection Service, if a Material Modification request on the Surplus Host Unit is submitted, the surplus Interconnection Request will be paused. Once the Material Modification request has been approved, the surplus Interconnection Request will be reevaluated and may require the Interconnection Customer to update the surplus Interconnection Request. The updated surplus

---

<sup>20</sup> Transmittal at 6 (citing MISO, Tariff, attach. X (Generator Interconnection Procedures) (184.0.0), § 3.3.1.1).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 6, 10-11. MISO uses the newly defined term, “surplus host unit,” in GIP sections 3.3.1.1 (Additional Requirements for a Surplus Interconnection Request application) and 3.3.1.2 (Evaluation Process for Surplus Interconnection Request and the Requirements for the Request to Remain Valid). MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), §§ 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2.

<sup>22</sup> MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 3.3.1.1(5) (185.0.0).

Interconnection Request is subject to the surplus Interconnection Request timing requirements.<sup>23</sup>

11. MISO states it has proposed these revisions in response to delays it has observed due to a material modification request for a surplus host unit that is approved after the submission of a surplus interconnection request. MISO states that if it approves a material modification in the middle of a surplus interconnection study, the results of the initial study become invalid, as MISO has worked to study a surplus interconnection request without considering the approved material modification. MISO states that it cannot incorporate proposed modifications into a surplus interconnection study before they are approved, because if it rejects the material modification, MISO must restudy the surplus interconnection request based on the initially proposed surplus host unit. MISO also states that there are circumstances where the interconnection customer of the surplus host unit withdraws a material modification mid-analysis or the surplus interconnection request is withdrawn if the material modification is not approved. MISO states that it has concluded that surplus interconnection requests that are studied while a material modification request for the surplus host unit is pending approval lend themselves to iterative and unnecessary restudies. MISO states that, consequently, it proposes a mechanism that will allow MISO to pause active surplus interconnection studies upon the submission of a material modification request or if a surplus interconnection request is submitted after a material modification has been submitted by an intended surplus host unit. MISO states that such a mechanism would allow sufficient flexibility for interconnection customers to submit material modifications without hindering MISO's obligation to complete studies in a timely fashion.<sup>24</sup>

12. Third, MISO proposes new GIP section 3.3.1.1(4), which provides that: "The surplus Interconnection Request must be submitted to the Transmission Provider by the Interconnection Customer at least one (1) year prior to the Commercial Operation Date of the Generating Facility requesting Surplus Interconnection Service."<sup>25</sup> MISO states that it has encountered situations where it cannot reasonably complete its surplus interconnection study processes before the surplus interconnection customer's expected commercial operation date. MISO states that, unlike interconnection requests processed in its Definitive Planning Phase (DPP) or generator replacement process, the Tariff does not limit when the interconnection customer may submit its surplus interconnection

---

<sup>23</sup> MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 3.3.1.2(1).

<sup>24</sup> Transmittal at 8, 11-12.

<sup>25</sup> MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 3.3.1.1(4).

request in relation to its expected commercial operation date.<sup>26</sup> MISO asserts that limitations on the earliest expected commercial operation date for a generating facility requesting surplus interconnection service will ensure that MISO can perform the necessary studies and administrative tasks and set reasonable customer expectations for how long MISO requires to process a surplus interconnection request.<sup>27</sup>

13. Fourth, MISO proposes to delete the word “unexpectedly” from GIP section 3.3.1.3(1). This provision (prior to the deletion, which is italicized here) reads:

In the event that the Interconnection Customer seeks to continue Surplus Interconnection Service following the retirement and permanent cessation of commercial operation of the Existing Generating Facility associated with that Surplus Interconnection Service, Transmission Provider shall permit the Surplus Interconnection Service to continue for a limited period not to exceed one (1) year if the Existing Generating Facility retired *unexpectedly* and if the following conditions are met[.]<sup>28</sup>

MISO states that it has a difficult time evaluating—and interconnection customers articulating—whether the retirement of a generating facility was truly “unexpected.”<sup>29</sup> MISO states that the deletion of this “expectation requirement” will ensure that all interconnection customers, regardless of the nature of the surplus host unit’s retirement, can have procedural certainty as to when its own surplus interconnection service will cease.

14. Fifth, MISO proposes revisions to increase the study deposit from \$60,000 to \$150,000.<sup>30</sup> MISO states that the \$60,000 study deposit amount was adopted in 2019 and

---

<sup>26</sup> Under MISO’s GIP, MISO studies generator interconnection requests through its three-phase DPP process. MISO, Tariff, attach. X (GIP) (184.0.0), § 7 (Definitive Planning Phase).

<sup>27</sup> Transmittal at 11.

<sup>28</sup> MISO, Tariff, attach. X, § 3.3.1.3(1) (emphasis added).

<sup>29</sup> Transmittal at 9.

<sup>30</sup> MISO’s current Tariff assesses a \$60,000 study deposit for both surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests within the same section of its GIP. MISO states that by modifying the study deposit for one, it has *de facto* modified the study deposit for the other. *Id.* at 6 & n.36, 11.

is inadequate to cover the costs to perform the various studies and other administrative processes necessary to process a surplus interconnection or generator replacement request. MISO states that of a recent group of 26 surplus interconnection requests, the study costs for 58% of the requests were expected to exceed \$60,000. Additionally, MISO states that it reviewed the 13 most recent generator replacement requests and found that the average study costs far exceeded the deposit amount collected by MISO. MISO states that an insufficient study deposit causes unnecessary study delays because, when the study deposit is depleted, MISO stops processing the interconnection request until funds are replenished.<sup>31</sup> MISO states that the proposed amount is sufficient to cover the cost of a majority of surplus interconnection and generator replacement studies, with additional funds for requests where costs may exceed the average study amounts. MISO states that any unused portion of the study deposit will be refunded.<sup>32</sup>

15. Additionally, MISO proposes revisions to GIP section 3.3.1<sup>33</sup> to require a non-refundable deposit 1 (D1), in addition to the increased \$150,000 study deposit that may be refundable if unused, for surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests.<sup>34</sup> MISO states that currently it does not collect a non-refundable deposit for surplus interconnection or generator replacement requests, only the study deposit. MISO states that, historically, it has required a non-refundable deposit from interconnection requests in the DPP to reduce the number of speculative requests submitted. MISO argues that, given the recent growth in, and increasing complexity of, surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests, the surplus interconnection and generator replacement processes would benefit from similar protections. MISO states that existing D1 requirements will apply, such that the surplus interconnection and generator replacement request D1 will be adjusted for inflation according to the procedures in GIP section 3.3.1, whereby MISO determines the inflation adjustment in accordance with the inflation calculator on the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics website, and the adjustment is calculated from the original August 2008 D1 amount of \$5,000.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* at 7-8, 11.

<sup>33</sup> MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 3.3.1 (185.0.0).

<sup>34</sup> MISO's proposed revisions to GIP section 3.3.1 state that: "An Interconnection Request for a Replacement Generating Facility and/or Surplus Interconnection Service shall be accompanied by a *Non-Refundable Deposit 1 (D1)* and a study deposit in the amount of \$150,000." *Id.* (emphasis added).

<sup>35</sup> Transmittal at 11; MISO, Proposed Tariff, attach. X (185.0.0), § 3.3.1.

16. Finally, MISO proposes ministerial edits to uncapitalize “surplus” in its GIP and Appendix 1 to its GIP when it uses the term “surplus interconnection request,” as this change will make clear that “surplus interconnection request” is not a Tariff-defined term.<sup>36</sup>

### **III. Notice of Filing and Responsive Pleadings**

17. Notice of MISO’s filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 91 Fed. Reg. 8216 (Feb. 20, 2026), with interventions and protests due on or before March 6, 2026. Timely motions to intervene were filed by: Alliant Energy Corporate Services, Inc.; American Electric Power Service Corporation, on behalf of its affiliates AEP Indiana Michigan Transmission Company, Inc., AEP Energy Partners, Inc., and AEP Retail Energy Partners LLC; Cooperative Energy; Entergy Services, LLC, on behalf of Entergy Arkansas, LLC, Entergy Louisiana, LLC, Entergy Mississippi, LLC, Entergy New Orleans, LLC, and Entergy Texas, Inc. (collectively, the Entergy Operating Companies); the MISO Transmission Owners (MISO TOs);<sup>37</sup> and Solar Energy Industries Association.

---

<sup>36</sup> *Id.* at 9, 12. MISO proposes to implement this ministerial change where the “surplus Interconnection Request” appears in GIP sections 3.2.3.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2, and GIP Appendix 1 at § 4.o.

<sup>37</sup> For purposes of this filing, MISO TOs consist of: Ameren Services Company, as agent for Union Electric Company doing business as Ameren Missouri, Ameren Illinois Company doing business as Ameren Illinois, and Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois; American Transmission Company LLC; Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Citizens Electric Corporation; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Cleco Power LLC; Cooperative Energy; Dairyland Power Cooperative; Duke Energy Business Services, LLC for Duke Energy Indiana, LLC; East Texas Electric Cooperative; the Entergy Operating Companies; Great River Energy; GridLiance Heartland LLC; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; Indianapolis Power & Light Company doing business as AES Indiana; International Transmission Company doing business as ITCTransmission; ITC Midwest LLC; Lafayette Utilities System; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern Indiana Public Service Company LLC; Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, and Northern States Power Company, a Wisconsin corporation, subsidiaries of Xcel Energy Inc.; Northwestern Wisconsin Electric Company; Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power, Inc.; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company doing business as CenterPoint Energy Indiana South; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.

#### IV. Discussion

##### A. Procedural Matters

18. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2025), the timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.

##### B. Substantive Matters

19. We accept MISO's proposed Tariff revisions, effective April 15, 2026, as requested. We find that the proposed revisions are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential and accomplish the purposes of the surplus interconnection service reforms set forth in Order Nos. 845 and 2023 and therefore meet the independent entity variation standard.<sup>38</sup>

20. We find that the proposed Tariff revisions concerning surplus interconnection service will help increase clarity, improve MISO's ability to conduct surplus interconnection service studies on a timely basis, and ensure that such studies produce more accurate results for surplus interconnection customers. As such, these changes will help increase efficiency and facilitate the use of surplus interconnection service and thereby accomplish the purposes of Order Nos. 845 and 2023.

21. First, we find MISO's proposal to create the defined term "surplus host unit" will help the relevant parties distinguish the rights and responsibilities of generating facilities offering surplus interconnection service from generating facilities seeking or receiving surplus interconnection service.

22. Second, we agree with MISO that its two proposals related to the timing of surplus interconnection studies and material modification requests for the surplus host unit will give interconnection customers flexibility to modify an interconnection request without hindering MISO's obligation to complete surplus interconnection studies in a timely fashion. We also find that these revisions will reduce the need for restudies that would otherwise be made necessary by material modifications.

23. Third, we find MISO's proposal to require that surplus interconnection requests be submitted at least one year prior to the commercial operation date of the generating facility requesting surplus interconnection service will provide interconnection customers with a more accurate expectation of the time it takes MISO to process surplus interconnection requests.

---

<sup>38</sup> See *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 190 FERC ¶ 61,083, at P 31 (2025).

24. Fourth, we find MISO's proposed revisions to remove the word "unexpectedly" from GIP section 3.3.1.3 will provide interconnection customers greater certainty as to when their surplus interconnection service will cease and that the proposed ministerial edits will provide greater clarity in the Tariff.

25. Finally, we find MISO's proposal to increase the study deposit for surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests from \$60,000 to \$150,000 more accurately reflects the costs required to process the average surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests, and will reduce the occurrences of study deposit shortfalls that, in turn, cause study delays.<sup>39</sup> We also find that MISO has demonstrated that its proposal to extend the application of the existing non-refundable D1 deposit requirements to surplus interconnection and generator replacement requests will help reduce the submission of speculative requests.

The Commission orders:

MISO's proposed Tariff revisions are hereby accepted, effective April 15, 2026, as requested, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Debbie-Anne A. Reese,  
Secretary.

---

<sup>39</sup> See *Sw. Power Pool, Inc.*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,050, at P 21 (2024) (finding that SPP's proposal would ensure that study deposit amounts would more accurately reflect SPP's estimated costs of conducting such studies and that SPP had sufficient funds available to cover its costs to complete the studies without the need for additional invoices and collections from interconnection customers).

## **Appendix – Tariff Records**

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.  
FERC Electric Tariff

- [ATTACHMENT X, Generator Interconnection Procedures \(GIP\) \(185.0.0\)](#)
- [Attachment X: Appendix 1, Interconnection Request for a Generating Facility \(60.0.0\)](#)

Document Content(s)

ER26-1397-000.docx.....1